

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1 and 3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Claims 1 and 3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by *Asai* (U.S. Patent No. 5,593,710; previously of record).

The Examiner is thanked for indicating that claims 5 and 7-8 are allowed.

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, and under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) are improper and therefore should be withdrawn. Accordingly, claims 1 and 3 remain pending for further consideration while claims 5 and 7-8 are allowed.

The Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph

Claims 1 and 3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claims contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The Final Office Action at Section 2 of page 2 indicates that claims 1 and 3 have been amended to recite that “the temperature of [the] conduction member is different from that of

[the] mold bodies,” and alleges that this feature of the apparatus has not previously been disclosed, and thus constitutes new matter. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Applicants respectfully submit that the above-mentioned feature of the apparatus is supported at least by lines 2-11 of page 18 in the specification. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, be withdrawn.

The Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) based on *Asai*

Claims 1 and 3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by *Asai*. This rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

The Final Office Action at paragraph 2 of page 5 indicates that “Applicants’ argument seems to be that the cutter would block all the heating emanating from the sprue bushing, and thus, that the bushing 72 cannot act to suppress any heat.” The Final Office Action goes to allege that “[h]owever, the cutter would not act to completely block all the heat from the sprue from being transmitted to the mold block.” Applicants respectfully disagree.

As presented at last paragraph of page 9 in the previous Amendment filed on July 31, 2003, *Asai* discloses that a female cutter 25 is disposed between the center bushing 72 and a sprue bushing 22 and connected to a mirror plate 70, thereby the heat from the sprue bushing 22 being transmitted to the mirror plate 70 through the female cutter 25. In other words, Applicants still respectfully submit that the center busing 72 cannot be used as the “first heat suppressing member for suppressing heat within said conduction path from being transmitted to said first of said pair of mold bodies,” as recited in claim 1.

Specifically, in *Asai*, since the heat from the sprue bushing 22 is transmitted through the cutter 25 to the mirror plate 70, no element can function as means for suppressing (reducing) the transmission of the heat to the mirror plate 7. That is, Applicants respectfully submit that the bushing 72 in *Asai* cannot serve as heat suppressing means, and therefore *Asai* fails to disclose any element corresponding to the annular ring 2, serving as an exemplary first heat suppressing means claimed in the instant application.

With respect to independent claim 1, Applicants still respectfully submit that *Asai* does not teach or suggest the claimed combination including at least “first heat suppressing member for suppressing heat within said conduction path from being transmitted to said first of said pair of mold bodies,” and that “the temperature of said conduction member is different from that of said mold bodies.”

Similarly, with respect to independent claim 3, Applicants still respectfully submit that *Asai* does not teach or suggest the claimed combination including at least “first heat suppressing means for suppressing heat within said conduction path from being transmitted to said first of said pair of mold bodies,” and that “the temperature of said conduction means is different from that of said mold bodies.”

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) should be withdrawn because *Asai* does not teach or suggest each feature of independent claims 1 and 3. As pointed out in MPEP § 2131, “[t]o anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim.” Thus, “[a] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a

single prior art reference. Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. Of California, 2 USPQ 2d 1051,
1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)."

With no other rejection pending, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 3, 5, 7 and
8 are in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants request the entry of this Request for Reconsideration to place the application in clear condition for allowance or, in the alternative, in better form for appeal. Applicants also request the Examiner's reconsideration and reexamination of the application and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

Applicants respectfully request a one-month extension of time. Please charge our Deposit Account No. 50-0310 in an amount of \$110.00 for the extension fee.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.R.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully Submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: 

Robert J. Goodell
Reg. No. 41, 040

Dated: February 19, 2004

Customer No.: 009629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Telephone: (202) 739-3000
Facsimile: (202) 739-3001